



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

our poetry but also in the conservative tradition of reading the service of the Church.

At all events, *forént* represents the required accentuation of iambic words at the close of a Ciceronian clausula, and why should this illustration of the force of secondary accent be an exception to the law of historical survival which seems to hold good for the other phenomena examined? I may add that Zielinski's contention seems to derive support, so far as it goes, from the fact that a historical survival of the accentuation represented by *forént* in oratory and poetry is the best explanation, indeed, it is the only satisfactory explanation yet offered, of the preference for iambic words at the close of the pentameter which is expressed in Ovid's famous law of the dissyllable.

Be that as it may, it is no slight recommendation of Zielinski's study that, aside from the solid contribution it has made to the subject concerned, it is suggestive of possibilities long buried in the language and literary art of antiquity which bid fair to rival the interest of those which have so long lain perdu in the sands of Egypt.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by J. A. H. MURRAY, HENRY BRADLEY and W. A. CRAIGIE. Vol. VI, Lock-Lynn and M-Mandragon; Vol. VII, Onomastical-Outing, Outjet-Ozyat and P-Pargeted; Vol. VIII, R-Reactive and Reactively-Ree. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1903-1904.

In the last notice of the Oxford English Dictionary (A. J. P., XXIV 85-89), the work was brought down to January, 1903, inclusive. Since that date the quarterly parts have been issued regularly as above. The letters to M have been completed, and the letters O and Q, while M, P and R are under way. Dr. Bradley has still to complete M and N for Vol. VI; Dr. Murray, P for Vol. VII; and Mr. Craigie, R and S for Vol. VIII. This rate of progress is much greater than a few years ago, and as it is proposed to finish the work in ten volumes, we may, perhaps, be spared, after watching its progress for twenty years, to witness its completion and to congratulate its editors. The same high standard of excellence and thoroughness has been maintained, and it needs but the examination of any single part to appreciate the care and labor bestowed upon it. But the language itself moves with seven-league boots. We have only to open the last part that has come to hand, M-Mandragon, (October 1, 1904) to find the latest neologism,—for which our British cousins are solely responsible,—duly labelled and incorporated, namely, *Maffick*, verb,—with its derivatives, *Mafficking*, *Mafficker*, and *Maffick*, substantive,—explained as a “back-formation from *mafficking*, (i. e., the proper

name *Mafeking*, treated jocularly as a gerund or pres. ppie.),” and defined, “Originally used to designate the behaviour of the crowds (in London and other towns) that celebrated with uproarious rejoicings the relief of the British garrison besieged in Mafeking (17 May, 1900). Hence generally, to indulge in extravagant demonstrations of exultation on occasions of national rejoicing.”

As an illustration of fullness we find in this part that the verb *make* fills no less than thirty-five columns, nearly twelve pages, treated under ninety-six headings from A. D. 1000 on, but examples are not frequent in the Old English (Anglo-Saxon) period. Dr. Bradley says of this verb: “Many senses which later English shares with continental Teutonic are not recorded in Old English, or not until the end of the period; possibly the verb originally had some of these meanings, but was displaced in the literary dialect by synonyms. . . . The word is not very frequent in Old English; the most prominent uses are in causative and factitive applications, and in the phrase *hit macian*, ‘to make it,’=to act, behave,” under which meaning is given the oldest example, from King Alfred’s Boethius, A. D. 888, the only one cited from King Alfred, although we find several from Aelfric, A. D. 1000.

It is interesting to note the remarks sometimes made by Dr. Bradley, which serve to illustrate the differences between British and American usage. Under *Ma*, for instance, we have the definition: “A childish and colloquial shortening of *Mamma*. Now often ridiculed as *vulgar*.” Again, while *Ma’am* is “a colloquial shortening of *Madam*,” we are told that “the present tendency is to confine it to the speech of servants or other persons of markedly inferior position.” Neither of these remarks would apply to the United States, certainly not to the Southern States, where seventeenth century words and pronunciation are still in vogue and where the older use of *Ma’am*, the court use “in addressing the Queen or a royal princess,” is still maintained to a large extent in the best society. Under *Madam* we also find: “In oral use the title now rarely occurs; from the 18th century it has been, except in very formal use, largely superseded by the contracted form *Ma’am*, which has itself in recent years been greatly restricted in currency.”

Under *Mad* it seems to be finally settled that it is an “aphetic representation of O. E. *gemaēd(e)d* (see *Amad*) pa. pple. of **gemaēdan*, to render insane, from *gemād*, insane (‘*vecors*, *gemaad*,’ Corpus Glossary).” While the sense “beside oneself with anger; moved to uncontrollable rage; furious,” is recognized and illustrated, it is pronounced “now only *colloquial*. In many dialects in Great Britain and the U. S. the ordinary word for ‘angry’”. In this sense it is “good English” in the United States.

Again, under *Mamma* we find the remarks: “In educated use, so far as is known, the stress has in England always been on the last syllable; in the United States, however, the stress *mám*-

ma is the more usual [ʔ]; a prevailing U. S. pronunciation is represented by the spelling *momma* [!], occasionally used in novels." Also, and finally: "In the 18th century, although *mámma* as used by young children was probably common, *mammá* seems to have been confined to the higher classes, and among them to have been freely used not only by children but by adults of both sexes. In the 19th century its use was much extended, and among the lower middle class was a mark of 'gentility.' Latterly it has in England become unfashionable, even as used by children." Such a broad statement would be erroneous for the United States.

Passing back to the letter L we find the verb *Look* occupying the first place in extent of meanings, and filling sixteen columns, with appended adverbs and prepositions, arranged under forty-seven headings. Like *Make* it is an Old English weak verb that takes us back to King Alfred and Aelfric for the earliest examples of its use, with developed significations in modern times, as in *look sharp*, the earliest example of which collocation is from the *Spectator*, not yet two hundred years ago. *Loco-foco* is dubbed "U. S.," and called "an invented word; it is not known what suggested the formation," but as originally applicable to "a self-igniting cigar or match" (Bartlett), the suggestion in Webster's International Dictionary that it was from *loco foci* is a very reasonable one. Its application in 1834 to a section of the Democratic party in New York, and later to the party itself, is of course from the use of *loco-foco* matches to re-light Tammany Hall, as detailed both here and in Webster. Many of us can still remember when all Democrats were called Locofocos, but I doubt whether the younger generation has ever heard the term used. Considering the length of time that the word *Logistics* has been in use,—certainly anterior to 1861,—it is strange that the earliest quotation is from Gen. Richard Taylor's "Destruction and Reconstruction" (1879), a sentence in which he calls Gen. Joseph E. Johnston "a master of logistics," but the word came into English from the French long before that date. A recent example is the following from Rhodes's History of the United States, Vol. V, p. 226 (1904): "It [i. e., transportation of troops and supplies] developed through our mechanical ingenuity into an indispensable branch of logistics." However, we can supply a brand-new quotation for the use of the adverb "logistically," from Mrs. Longstreet's recent book, "Lee and Longstreet at High Tide" (1904), page 47, line 10, anent the much-disputed question as to the intended time of Gen. Longstreet's attack at Gettysburg on the second day, July 2d, 1863: "it was logistically and morally impossible to make an attack at daylight."

This small portion of M contains 3175 main words and combinations, as against 1817 in the Century Dictionary, its closest rival, 2459 are illustrated by quotations to 496 in the Century, and the quotations number 12,855 compared to 1088 in the Century.

The adjective *Open* fills nearly six columns, with significations and phrases arranged under twenty-two headings, but notwithstanding this fullness, I miss a very common use in this country as, an *open* account = unpaid, and, more technical, in speaking of accounts, so much paid, so much *open*. Interesting articles are those on the obsolete *or* = before, and *or*, the alternative particle. The former was strengthened by the addition of *ever*, *e'er*, as in Daniel vi, 24, and the equivalent *ere*, as in Shakspeare, King Lear ii, 4, 288.

As illustrating the historical character of the work many examples are given of *Ore* (O. E. *ár*) = respect, honour; also favour, mercy, a word obsolete since the fifteenth century, but supplied with illustrative quotations from the "Beowulf" on, and especially frequent in the mediaeval romances and in Chaucer, as "bi godes ore," "for Goddes ore," and in the prayerful ejaculation, "Swete Jesu, thin ore!" Besides the two *Or*'s, attention is called to the historical treatment of *Other*, *Our*, *Ought* and *Out*, but it would prolong this notice to too great length to give a tithe of the words of great interest that present themselves to even a cursory reader. Shakspeare is our earliest authority for many *out*-verbs, as in such expressions as "it out-Herods Herod" (Hamlet iii, 2, 16), in the use of which he has had many followers and imitators, but there is no limit to these formations. Ben Jonson is responsible for *out-zany*, Tennyson for *out-woman'd*, and, to give credit where it is due, Lowell has supplied "out-Miltons Milton," and The Literary World (U. S.), "out-Zolas Zola." The final section of *O* contains *Over* and the *Over*-compounds, which are more numerous than those of *Out*, pp. 286-289 exhibiting "760 of them classified under 40 senses or uses, while 1413 others are treated as main words in the following 50 pages." *Overslaugh* is from the Dutch *overslaan* (Germ. *überschlagen*), and dates from 1768, but in the usual sense in which it is used in this country—hence marked U. S.,—only from 1846. The examples under *Overflow* show the transition from the strong verb of Old English to the weak verb of more recent date, but both forms seem to have been used alongside of each other, and only in very recent times have the weak forms predominated. The earliest instance given of the weak preterite is from Genesis and Exodus, 1250, ouer-flow3ed, but Dr. Morris ("Elem. Lessons in Hist. Eng. Gram.," p. 140) gives from Capgrave's Chronicle, c. 1470, "The flood that *ovyr-flew* al the world." So for the past participle we find from the Paston Letters, 1477, *overflowyn*, and from other works, 1585 *overflowne*, 1600 *overflowed*, 1673 *overflown*, and even as late as 1863 *overflown*, which one might denominate bad English by that time, but it all depends upon the frequency of use of that form.

Other words in this Section that deserve special attention from both the historical and the lexical points of view are *Owe* and *Own*, both adjective and verb. Of the latter Dr. Murray says: "It seems as if the verb itself went out of use before 1300 but was restored from the derivative *owner*, when *owe* in its original

sense of 'possess' was becoming obsolescent." The sense 'confess' is not older than 1650, and the earliest example given of 'own up' is from Trollope, 1880.

The first Section of P is remarkable for containing few native words. Out of the 2454 main words treated "only ONE," says Dr. Murray, "can claim to be a native Old English word, viz., *pan*, the culinary vessel." The introductory article explains how this letter "has grown to be one of the three gigantic letters of the modern English Dictionary," S and C being the other two, and the three including nearly a third of all the words. This is due chiefly to the enormous influx of words from Latin through French, and some directly, and from Greek, for here we have the *pan*- and *para*-, *peri*- and *pro*- compounds. Many other tongues have also contributed their quota, the modern European from Danish to Italian and from Portuguese to Croatian and Turkish; also Persian, Hindustani, Tamil, Burmese, Chinese, Malay, Maori, Peruvian, Tupi, Carib, Algonkin, Seelmana,—in fact, English seems to have plundered the linguistic world. The reason why there are so few native words beginning with P is that they were *not there* in Old English, as every linguistic student knows. "Original P in Germanic or Teutonic represents an Indo-European B. But, *initially*, B was of rare occurrence in Indo-European, and it is not certain that any of the words in which it so occurred were retained in Teutonic, where initial P was consequently very rare."

Illustrations of words in R must be very briefly noted. In view, however, of the varying pronunciation of this letter in different parts of the United States, the remarks of Mr. Craigie on "modern standard English" will be of especial interest to the many amateur critics of Southern speech. He says: "This trill is almost or altogether absent in the *r* of modern standard English, which moreover retains its consonantal value only when it precedes a vowel; in other positions it has been vocalized to an *ə*-sound, . . and even this is entirely lost after certain vowels." This puts the Oxford Dictionary on the side of the ordinary Southern pronunciation of *r* final as "standard English." The adage connecting oysters with the *r*-months dates back to 1599 (H. Buttes, *Dyets drie Dinner*); "the three R's" is not found earlier than 1828, and is said to have originated as a toast with Sir W. Curtis (1752-1829); and "R. S. V. P." was in use in 1845. The *Athenaeum* of Apr. 5, 1879, speaks of "Romanism, Ritualism, and Rationalism" as "the three r's of theological controversy," but Americans will miss the three r's of political controversy used by the Rev. Dr. Burchard, "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion,"—which is said to have defeated Blaine for the Presidency only five years later.

JAMES M. GARNETT.